THE
Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 16, No. 17 (Broadcast 766) April 27, 1970 Dallas, Texas

DAN SMOOT

WE NEED DEFENSE, NOT DISARMAMENT

From 1958 to 1963, Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy prohibited American testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere (urgently needed for national security). They were keeping a moratorium agreement with the Soviets, trying to persuade the Soviets to sign a Test Ban Treaty. All the while, the Soviets were violating the moratorium agreement freely, conducting tests to develop a defense against intercontinental ballistic missiles — a defense which we desperately need but have denied ourselves.(1)

In July, 1963 — having achieved a dangerous lead over us in developing a missile-killer weapon — the Soviets signed the Test Ban Treaty to keep us from conducting the kind of testing they had already completed. In September, 1963, the Senate ratified the treaty, despite objections by leading American military experts and scientists.(1)

In October, 1963, the Johnson administration announced that the U.S. would obey a UN General Assembly Outer Space resolution banning the "Placing in orbit around the earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, installing such weapons on celestial bodies, or stationing such weapons in outer space in any other manner." President Johnson initiated talks with the Soviet Union to negotiate an Outer Space Treaty outlawing orbital weapons.(1)

While talking, the Soviets were testing and developing orbital weapons. When they had pushed development of space weapons until they had a lead over us, they signed the Outer Space Treaty to stop our research and development. The Soviets completed a series of orbital bomb tests on January 25, 1967 — signed the treaty outlawing orbital bombs on January 27, 1967. The Senate ratified the Outer Space Treaty on April 25, 1967. The first known violation of the treaty occurred three weeks later — May 17, 1967, when the Soviets renewed their testing of orbital bombs. They have been violating the treaty ever since.(1)

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., Box 9538, Dallas, Texas 75214 (office at 6441 Gaston Ave.). Subscriptions: $18.00 for 2 years; $10.00, 1 year; $6.00, 6 months. Dan Smoot was born in Missouri, reared in Texas. With BA and MA degrees from SMU (1938 and 1940), he joined the Harvard faculty (1941) as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent; from 1951 to 1955, a commentator on national radio and television. In 1955, he started his present independent, free-enterprise business: publishing this REPORT and abbreviating it each week for radio and TV broadcasts available for commercial sponsorship by business firms.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1970. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nonetheless, as soon as the Outer Space Treaty was ratified, President Johnson initiated talks with the Soviets for another nuclear agreement — this one, the Nonproliferation Treaty, to prohibit nuclear powers from disseminating nuclear weapons to non-nuclear powers.[1] The Nonproliferation Treaty was signed by the U.S., the Soviets, and 60 other nations on July 1, 1968. The Senate ratified it on March 13, 1969.

President Nixon immediately began talking about negotiating a Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty with the Soviets. On December 22, 1969, the administration announced that SALT talks with the Soviets would begin at once in Finland, and that formal negotiations on a treaty would begin April 16, 1970.

Meanwhile, we are drastically reducing our nuclear capacity, as the Soviets rapidly expand theirs.

The Soviets have had a defense against missiles for years. We have none, and liberals say that we will offend the Soviets if we build a defense against their missiles.

Last year, the Senate, by a margin of one vote, approved President Nixon's Safeguard antiballistic missiles system; but we still do not have any part of the ABM system deployed, or even under serious development. Moreover, Safeguard will not provide adequate defense, even when fully developed and deployed. Nixon's Safeguard defense is a weakened version of the Sentinel defense system Johnson recommended his last year in office; and Johnson's Sentinel system was a weakened version of what U. S. military authorities have for years claimed to be necessary for defense of this country.[2]

In January, 1970, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird announced that the Soviets have also gained superiority over us in offensive nuclear missiles. About a year ago, Laird predicted that if the Soviets kept deploying their mammoth SS-9 offensive missiles at the rate then prevailing, they would have the capacity, by 1974, not only to destroy all major American cities but also to knock out 95% of our deployed missiles, thus making it impossible for us even to retaliate.[2, 3] Now, Laird says, the Soviets are deploying the huge offensive missiles so fast that they will be in condition to kill us *before 1974.*

Laird does not, however, recommend that we protect ourselves. On the contrary, he says the U.S. must "reorder its priorities" and cut military spending about $5 billion below present levels. He is not talking about cutting out *wasteful spending* or *foreign spending.* He is talking about cutting down on national defense, so that we can increase spending on social programs.

It should be noted in this regard that federal spending on "social programs" has increased more than three times as much as spending on defense since 1964.[3]

Throughout the political campaign of 1968, President Nixon criticized the "security gap" that the Johnson administration had created by letting the Soviets overtake us in nuclear power. He promised to rebuild the American nuclear arsenal until the U.S. had clear superiority over the Soviets. Since Nixon became President, however, the "security gap" has widened alarmingly.

Cutbacks in our national defense (some caused by Congress; some initiated by the Nixon administration) have not only left us without any prospect of defending ourselves against nuclear attack, but have also left one-fifth of the land area of the United States — Alaska — without adequate defense against *conventional attack.* At a time when Alaska's strategic importance has been enhanced by discovery of the biggest proven oil reserves on the North American continent, the Nixon administration is closing the Kodiak Naval Station, withdrawing the last fighter squadron from Alaska, and deactivating two Nike-Hercules missiles sites near Fairbanks. We will not have enough conventional military power on hand in Alaska to defend the people, the cities, the land, the great oil reserves, or the shipping lanes that link Alaska with the union.[4]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To communists, the give-and-take of negotiations means that communists take and the other side gives. If they want an agreement to bind the other side, communists may promise something in return; but they never keep a promise that requires them to do something they do not want to do or to refrain from doing something they want done.

Consequently, whenever we negotiate with communists any kind of agreement having anything to do with our national security, we invite disaster. We limit our activities to comply with the terms of the agreement, but the communists do not. It is, therefore, dangerous folly for the Nixon administration to engage in Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty talks with the Soviets.

We ought to stop the talks. We ought to stop the harmful and illegal multi-billion-dollar federal spending on "social programs." We ought to stop foreign aid, stop financing the United Nations and all its related agencies, and stop spending multiplied billions of dollars defending other nations.

The money saved by stopping such activities would more than pay for adequate national defense.

If monopolistic unions and new-left-communists can elect enough Senators to block presidential appointments to the Supreme Court, why cannot constitutional conservatives elect enough Members of Congress to block presidential programs and policies that are manifestly harmful to the nation?

I believe we could, if all of us tried hard enough.

* * * *

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL: In 1952, the Truman Justice Department had a tax case pending against U. S. Representative Adam Clayton Powell (Harlem Democrat). That was a presidential election year, and the Harlem vote was important. Powell — though a scandal to the rest of the nation — is a political power in Harlem, and has considerable influence among Negroes in other big cities. Powell startled his Democrat colleagues by suddenly announcing in 1952 that he was supporting Republican Dwight D. Eisenhower for President. After Eisenhower's inauguration, the Department of Justice dropped the tax case against Powell.[5]

In the next fifteen years, Powell became internationally infamous for his misuse of the power and money of the House Education and Labor Committee (of which he became chairman), for his contemptuous conduct toward New York courts, and for many other improprieties.

On March 1, 1967, the House, acting under public pressure, refused to seat Powell.

A federal district court refused to order the House to seat him, and a Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the lower court. Powell appealed to the Supreme Court.[6]

Meanwhile, the FBI, a grand jury, and the Department of Justice were preparing to prosecute Powell.[5] It was not easy, because the day the House excluded him, Powell led a raid on the House Labor Committee file room and stole official files going back two years — files which contained proof of Powell's falsification of records and theft of thousands of dollars.[7]

The Department of Justice could not make a case against Powell for the theft of the files, because it could not get the cooperation of John McCormack, Democrat Speaker of the House.[7]

Handicapped as they were, however, the FBI and Justice Department attorneys produced crates full of documentation to support an indictment against Powell on at least 50 criminal charges, with penalties adding up to more than 150 years in prison, and $300,000 in fines.[7]

The case was ready for trial in another presidential election year — 1968. As early as May of that year, it was evident that Lyndon Johnson and his Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, were holding back on the Powell prosecution.[5]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Powell spent most of the year in the Bahamas, but was reelected to Congress from his Harlem district.

On December 9, a month after the 1968 elections, Ramsey Clark formally dismissed charges against Powell for "lack of evidence."[8]

That was generally considered as clearing the way for seating Powell in Congress in 1969. H. R. Gross (Iowa Republican) and a few other sturdy conservatives in Congress fought against the seating of Powell; but they lost. Powell was seated (though stripped of seniority and fined).

In June, 1969, Earl Warren, in one of his last official acts as Chief Justice, participated in an illegal Supreme Court decision holding that the House had no right to exclude Powell in 1967.[9]

Representative Gross asked the Nixon administration to do something about Powell; but, evidently, he lost there too. President Nixon and Attorney General John Mitchell talk much about law and order; but the mammoth file detailing some 50 criminal violations of law by Adam Clayton Powell is still gathering dust in Justice Department files.[7] And Adam Clayton Powell — who ought to be in prison — is still a Member of Congress, in a position to vote on legislation vitally affecting the personal affairs of every American.

* * * *

UNHOLY POWER:[10] The power of government to order the lives and fortunes of its people through monetary and credit controls ought to be a first concern of every citizen. Yet it is doubtful if one citizen in fifty thousand is aware of the legislation approved in . . . Congress, delegating almost untrammeled power to the President and the Federal Reserve Board to control credit. . . .

The President . . . [while] waging unrelenting war on inflation . . . has failed thus far to make effective use of the weapon already in his hands; and that is, to DEMAND CUTS IN EXPENDITURES TO FIT TAX REVENUES.

To ask for and obtain through Congress the authority to delegate to a private institution, backed by the injunctive power of the federal courts, the absolute control of credit to every citizen of the United States, is unconscionable.

Except in the most dire and declared emergency, this is power no President should seek; and certainly its enforcement should never be delegated to an organization of private individuals. This kind of control over the lives and fortunes of citizens is the stuff of which dictators are made.

FOOTNOTES

(1) *Dan Smoot Report*, Feb. 20, 1967; Jan. 15, 22, 1968

(2) Richard Wilson's syndicated column, Jan. 20, 1970

(3) *Human Events*, Jan. 17, 1970, p. 3

(4) Edith Kermit Roosevelt's syndicated column, *National Defender*, Jan. 1970

(5) *Human Events*, May 25, 1968, p. 4

(6) *1968 Congressional Quarterly Almanac*, p. 198

(7) Jack Anderson's syndicated column, Nov. 11, 1969

(8) *New York Times*, Dec. 11, 1968, p. C27

(9) *New York Times*, June 17, 1969, pp. 1, 36

(10) "Unholy Power" is an extract from an article of the same title, written by U.S. Representative Gross (Iowa Republican), in his Legislative Report No. 1045.

Subscribe Today to The Dan Smoot Report

6 mos. $6.00 **– 1 YR. $10.00 –** 2 yrs. $18.00

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT

BOX 9538, DALLAS, TEXAS 75214

Telephone: TAylor 1-2303

Send reprints to your friends and suggest they order reprints too.

REPRINTS OF THIS ISSUE (for bulk mailing to one address):

1 copy	$ .25	100 copies	$ 6.50
10 copies	1.00	200 copies	12.00
25 copies	2.00	500 copies	28.00
50 copies	3.50	1000 copies	50.00

Texans Add 4¼% for Sales Tax

(Add 50c for special-handling postage)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED